

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 33, 42, 50, 55-56 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,919) in view of Slater (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,435); and claims 34-41, 43-47 and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,919) in view of Slater (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,435) and further in view of Mault (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0208409); claim 57 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,919) in view of Slater (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,435) and further in view of Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,947,571). Claims 33-58 were also rejected under 35 USC 101 as recited nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 33-60 are currently pending in this application. New claims 59 and 60 have been added. The rejections above have been traversed and, as such, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of claims 33-58.

2. As discussed above, claims 33, 42 and 50 were rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 33, 42 and 50 were amended to tie various claim elements to particular devices. As such, applicant respectfully submits that the claims 33-58 recite statutory subject matter and requests that this basis of rejection be withdrawn.

3. As discussed above, claim 33 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being anticipated by Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,919) in view of Slater (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,435).

While the applicant maintains the reasons presented in the prior response, claim 33 has been amended to include the following:

displaying an object class menu on the display device of the handheld cellular telephone, the object class menu having a plurality of object classes including a person class, a product class and an event class;

interacting with the user via the handheld cellular telephone to select one of the plurality of object classes from the object class menu;

displaying a task menu on the display device of the handheld cellular telephone, the task menu including a plurality of tasks that are based on the selected one of the plurality of object classes, the plurality of tasks including a restaurant reservation task;

interacting with the user via the handheld cellular telephone to select one of the plurality of tasks from the task menu;

transmitting the digital image from the handheld cellular telephone to a server system along with data indicating the selected one of the plurality of tasks;

when the selected one of the plurality of tasks is the restaurant reservation task;

identifying the restaurant via the server system, based on the recognition of the restaurant in the digital image of the location, and not based on the recognition of an optical code;

retrieving restaurant information via a computer network, based on the identification of the restaurant;

displaying at least a portion of the restaurant information on the handheld cellular telephone; and

facilitating reservations for the restaurant via the handheld cellular telephone.

In contrast, Ogasawara and Slater, and further Mault and Rhoads, lack the particular object and task menu structure set forth in the amended claim. For these reasons, claim 33 and claims 34-41 that depend therefrom are believed to be patentably distinct.

4. As discussed above, claim 50 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being anticipated by Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,919) in view of Slater (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,435).

While the applicant maintains the reasons presented in the prior response, claim 50 has been amended to include the following:

displaying an object class menu on the display device of the handheld cellular telephone, the object class menu having a plurality of object classes including a person class, a product class and an event class;

interacting with the user via the handheld cellular telephone to select one of the plurality of object classes from the object class menu;

displaying a task menu on the display device of the handheld cellular telephone, the task menu including a plurality of tasks that are based on the selected one of the plurality of object classes, the plurality of tasks including an event task;

interacting with the user via the handheld cellular telephone to select one of the plurality of tasks from the task menu;

transmitting the digital image from the handheld cellular telephone to a server system along with data indicating the selected one of the plurality of tasks;

when the selected one of the plurality of tasks is the event task;

identifying the event venue via the server system, based on the recognition of the event venue in the digital image, and not based on the recognition of an optical code;

retrieving event information via a computer network based on the recognition of the event venue;

facilitating at the event task associated with the event venue, based on the event information; and

displaying at least a portion of the event information on the handheld cellular telephone.

In contrast, Ogasawara and Slater, and further Mault and Rhoads, lack the particular object and task menu structure set forth in the amended claim. For these reasons, claim 50 and claims 51-58 that depend therefrom are believed to be patentably distinct.

5. As discussed above, claim 42 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being anticipated by Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,919) in view of Slater (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,435).

While the applicant maintains the reasons presented in the prior response, claim 42 has been amended to include the following:

receiving via the server system, a selection of an object class from an object class menu having a plurality of object classes including a person class, a product class and an event class;

receiving via the server system, a selection of a task, wherein the task includes making reservations for the restaurant; and

identifying the restaurant via the server system, based on the recognition of the restaurant in the digital image, and not based on the recognition of an optical code;

facilitating via the wireless communication device, the making of the reservations for the restaurant via communication with the computer network and based on the identification of the restaurant, wherein the facilitating includes retrieving restaurant information.

In contrast, Ogasawara and Slater, and further Mault and Rhoads, lack the particular object menu structure set forth in the amended claim. For these reasons, claim 42 and claims 43-49 that depend therefrom are believed to be patentably distinct.

6. As discussed above, new claims 59 and 60 have been added.

In particular, claim 59 recites that the restaurant reservation task was generated by another user and provided to the handheld cellular telephone via the computer network. Similarly, claim 60 recites that the event task was generated by another user and provided to the handheld cellular telephone via the computer network. Ogasawara and Slater, and further Mault and Rhoads, do not disclose displaying tasks on a task menu of a handheld cellular telephone that includes a task generated by another user. These claims are believed to further distinguish from the prior art.

Conclusions

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant believes that claims 33-58 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

A request for continuing examination and a petition for extension of time are concurrently filed herewith along with a credit card form authorizing payment of the associated fees and the fees for the two new claims. No additional fees are believed to be due. Please charge any additional required fees to deposit account No. 502126 (WLR002).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Bruce E. Stuckman reg. 36,693/
Bruce E. Stuckman
Phone: (512) 241-8444
Fax No. (512) 241-8445